

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 9-31 are pending. Claims 9, 11, 14, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25 and 27-31, which are independent, are hereby amended. Claims 1-8 are canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. No new matter is added by these amendments. Support for the amended recitations in the claims is found throughout the specification, particularly on page 45, line 1 to page 46, lines 25 of the present specification. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

**II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 103(a)**

Claims 9-12, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,289,314 to Matsuzaki et al.

Claims 13-18 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Matsuzaki.

Claims 19-24, 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Matsuzaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,671,412 to Christiano.

Claims 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Matsuzaki in view of Christiano and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,124 to Shimakawa et al.

Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*:

“An information processing apparatus...

wherein said usage control status stores Usage detail information contained in a control transfer status...” (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicant, U.S. Patent No. 6,289,314 to Matsuzaki et al. relates to a server that scrambles received pay information in an internal scrambler and then transmits the result to a terminal, which sent a request. A second charge managing portion determines a charge for the pay information for billing a contractor who manages the server, based on a coefficient of charge outputted from a terminal managing portion. The coefficient of charge is determined based on attributes of the terminal that uses the pay information, the number of the terminals, which use the pay information, attributes of users who use the terminals.

As understood by Applicant, U.S. Patent No. 5,671,412 to Christiano relates to a software license management system. A license server initializes a license database by receiving a package license description that includes component license descriptions for component software products in a package. Licenses for software products are also received, and license records are created in the license database for components and suite packages, where each record includes a number of licenses available to be checked out. A client computer system can request

a license for a component product in a package. A license is granted to the client when the client is allowed to receive the license according to a license policy.

As understood by Applicant, U.S. Patent No. 6,289,314 to U.S. Patent No. 6,502,124 to Shimakawa et al. relates to a software installment management method, and an apparatus for the method, which can prevent a greater number of software than a contracted license number from being installed in a server-client system. A server comprises a software management portion for saving software to be installed in a software storage portion, a table management portion for registering information representing an installment history of the software saved in the software storage portion and an information representing a license number to a history management table and to a license number management table.

Applicant submits that Matsuzaki, Christiano and Shimakawa - either taken alone or in combination - do not teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 9. Specifically, Applicant submits that there is no teaching or suggestion of a usage control status that stores Usage detail information contained in a control transfer status, as recited in claim 9.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claim 9 is patentable.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 9, amended independent claims 11, 14, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25 and 27-31 are also believed to be patentable.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claims 9, 11, 14, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25 and 27-31 are patentable.

### III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims, discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant

By Thomas F. Presson

Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800